

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the final Office Action of October 6, 2005.

35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as lacking utility. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 to eliminate the use of the word vacant. Applicants assert that presently amended independent claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 have been amended to contain clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and sets forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out Applicants' invention. Therefore, claim 1, 2, 4, and 19 through 21 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 5 through 7, 11 through 16, 18, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended the claimed invention to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention to comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, presently amended claims 7, 11 through 18, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are allowable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on Corbett (U.S. Patent 4,992,850)

Claims 5 through 7, 11 through 16, 18, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Corbett (U.S. Patent 4,992,850).

Applicants assert that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants assert that the inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 35 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by the Corbett et al. reference because the Corbett et al. reference does not identically describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the presently claimed inventions in as complete detail as is contained in the claims.

Turning to the Corbett et al. reference, described therein is a leadframe interconnect package that is tape automated bond (TAB) bonded to circuitry on the chip and which provides a circuit connection for subsequent connection to a printed circuit board. The encapsulated chips will replace both the lead frame and printed circuit board in a conventional SIMM module. The Corbett et al. reference only replaces a defective semiconductor die with another semiconductor die at the same location as the defective semiconductor die, not another location.

Applicants assert that the Corbett et al. reference fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, the elements of the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 calling for “having at least one second position having, in turn, a

predetermined configuration for locating a second semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the at least one other vacant position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”, “a substrate . . . having a third position having, in turn, a predetermined configuration for locating a third semiconductor device thereat, the third position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position, and having a fourth position having, in turn, a predetermined configuration for locating a fourth semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the second vacant position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”, and “a substrate . . . having a third predetermined configuration position for locating a third semiconductor device thereat, the third predetermined configuration position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position, and having a fourth predetermined configuration for locating a fourth semiconductor device thereat on the multi-chip module system, the fourth predetermined configuration position having no semiconductor device located thereat until a semiconductor device is installed to replace a defective semiconductor device at another position”. In contrast to the elements of the presently claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25, Applicants assert that the Corbett et al. reference is absent any description of a second position, a third position, and a fourth position for a semiconductor device to be placed thereat. The Corbett et al. reference only describes placing a semiconductor die at the same position that a defective semiconductor device has been removed therefrom. The presently claimed inventions of presently amended claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 are not described whatsoever by the Corbett et al. reference, either expressly or inherently, as Corbett et al. only replace defective semiconductor die with another semiconductor die at the same location as the defective semiconductor die was located. Such is not the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25. Therefore, Applicants assert that presently amended independent claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 23, and 25 are allowable as well as the currently pending dependent claims therefrom.

In summary for the reasons set forth herein, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 and the case passed for issue.

Applicants request entry of this amendment for the following reasons:

The amendment is timely filed.

The amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

The amendment does not require any further search.

In summary, for the reasons set forth herein, Applicants assert that claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the entry of this amendment, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4 through 7, 11 through 21, 23 through 25, and 29 through 36, and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 6, 2005

JRD/dlm:lmh

Document in ProLaw